



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/459,703	12/13/1999	Kiran A. Padwekar	884.027US1	1539	
21186	21186 7590 11/21/2003			EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			MEONSKE, TONIA L		
	P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2183	15	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	plicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/459,703	PADWEKAR, KIRAN A.
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tonia L Meonske	2183
-The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2003 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this : (1) a timely filed amendme peal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or t	p)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mab. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expired ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W. 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ending the period of the company of the period of the company of	nis Advisory Action, or (2) the date size later than SIX MONTHS from the AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS. The date on which the petition under a do of extension and the correspond of the shortened statutory period force later than three months after the	e mailing date of the final rejection. SOF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ing amount of the fee. The appropriate extension or reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2)
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 0) 	nt's Brief must be filed within	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require fu	ırther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appeal t	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can	celing a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	jection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		n considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered to raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		·
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	approved or b) disapprov	ved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure States	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)
 10.		62/19//

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)





Application No. 009/459,703

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Newly added limitation "into a memory heirarchy" in claim 17 and 23 would require further search and/or consideration. Furthermore, there is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On page 7, Applicant argues in essence:

"Deao does not teach each an every limitation of claim 1 because Deao's system does not teach a replay handler loaded into a memory heirarchy."

However, Deao has in fact taught a replay handler loaded into the memory heirarchy (Deao, Column 45, lines 7-14, "SWBP" is the replay handler loaded into memory element 23 of Figure 1, Column 23, Table 15, Figure 45, element 4512.) Therefore this argument is moot.

Applicant is reminded of the provisions of MPEP § 714.12 which states in pertinent part the following:

Once a final rejection that is not premature has been entered in an application, applicant or patent owner no longer has any right to unrestricted further prosecution.

The prosecution of an application before the examiner should ordinarily be concluded with the final action.

Applicant is additionally reminded of MPEP § 714.13 which states in pertinent part the following:

ENTRY NOT A MATTER OF RIGHT

It should be kept in mind that applicant cannot, as a matter of right, amend any finally rejected claims, add new claims after a final rejection (see 37 CFR 1.116) or reinstate previously canceled claims.

Except where an amendment merely cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, removes issues for appeal, or in some other way requires only a cursory review by the examiner, compliance with the requirement of a showing under 37 CFR 1.116(c) is expected in all amendments after final rejection.

Further examination of the application may be obtained by filing a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d), if appropriate. See MPEP § 201.06(d). CPA practice does not apply to utility or plant applications if the prior application has a filing date on or after May 29, 2000. See MPEP §706.07(h), paragraphs I and IV.